national accelerator laboratory

NAL-THY-86B

January 1973

TESTS FOR NEUTRAL CURRENTS IN WEAK PION PRODUCTION

C. H. ALBRIGHT,* B. W. LEE,† E.A. PASCHOS
National Accelerator Laboratory
P. O. Box 500, Batavia, Illinois 60510

and

L. WOLFENSTEIN
Department of Physics, Carnegie-Mellon University,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

ABSTRACT

Bounds for neutral currents are derived for the inclusive pion production on isoscalar nuclei in the simple Weinberg and the Glashow-Iliopoulos-Maiani models. The bounds involve cross sections induced by neutrinos, antineutrinos or combination thereof. Final state interactions are included in the results. For isolated proton targets a bound is obtained in both models independent of any additional assumptions. All the quantities occuring in the bounds are in principle measureable. For those processes where data are not yet available, estimates are presented by allowing a wide range of variation for the unknown quantities.

*Permanent Address: Department of Physics, Northern Illinois University DeKalb, Illinois 60115

†Permanent Address: Institute for Theoretical Physics, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 11790

I. INTRODUCTION

Several papers have appeared in the literature recently which attempt to place lower bounds on cross sections that would involve first order weakly-coupled neutral currents in the Weinberg model[1] of weak and electromagnetic interactions. The cross section ratios investigated include the elastic lepton interactions[2] $\nu_e + e \rightarrow \nu_e + e$ and $\nu_\mu + e \rightarrow \nu_\mu + e$, the elastic semileptonic interactions[3] $\nu_\mu + N \rightarrow \nu_\mu + N$, inelastic weak pion production[3,4] $\nu_\mu + N \rightarrow \nu_\mu + \pi + N$, and the inclusive reaction[5,6] $\nu_\mu + N \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ + anything.

The weak pion production bounds are of immediate interest to the experimentalist, but the bounds obtained invoke the assumptions of $\Delta(1236)$ dominance[7] and neglect the interaction of outgoing pions with other nucleons in a complex nucleus. The purpose of this paper is to deduce bounds for weak pion production that are more directly applicable to present experiments.

The relevant term in the effective Lagrangian is

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\bar{\mu}\gamma_\alpha(1+\gamma_5)\nu(J_\alpha^1 + i\,J_\alpha^2) + \text{h.c.} + \bar{\nu}\,\gamma_\alpha(1+\gamma_5)\nu\,J_\alpha^{(0)}\right) \quad (1)$$

$$J_\lambda^{(0)} = A_\lambda^3 + (1-2\sin^2\theta_W)\,V_\lambda^3 + J_\lambda^S \quad (2)$$

where $J^i = (V^i + A^i)$ is an isospin component of the usual V-A current, θ_W is the Weinberg angle,[1,2] and J^S is an isoscalar current. This form holds for the simple Weinberg model without strange particles and also for the Glashow-Iliopoulos-Maiani[3] version. In Eq. (1) and in our results we have set $\cos\theta_c = 1$; as in other papers our results are valid in the $m_\mu = 0$ limit.

In Section II we derive general inequalities that hold for models with an effective Lagrangian of the form given by (1) and (2). Numerical estimates are made in Section III which allow a comparison with experimental data. In Section IV we give some additional inequalities which hold only for the simple Weinberg model in which $J_\lambda^S = -2\sin^2\theta_W (J_\lambda^{em} - V_\lambda^3)$, J_λ^{em} being the electromagnetic current.

II. CROSS SECTION RATIO INEQUALITIES

Bound for weak pion production will first be derived for a complex nuclear target with I = 0. The use of an I = 0 target makes it possible by combining π^+ and π^- production to eliminate the isoscalar-isovector interference terms for the neutral and electromagnetic currents. The results are derived directly for nuclear targets without assuming neutrino scattering from individual nucleons; final state interactions other than those of electromagnetic origin are automatically included.

We define the cross-sections

$$\sigma_-^a = \sigma(\nu_\mu + N \to \mu^- + \pi^a + x) \tag{3a}$$

$$\sigma_o^a = \sigma(\nu_\mu + N \to \nu_\mu + \pi^a + x) \tag{3b}$$

$$\sigma_e^a = \sigma(e + N \rightarrow e + \pi^a + x) \qquad (3c)$$

$$\sigma^{ch} = \sigma^+ + \sigma^-, \quad \sigma^{tot} = \sigma^{ch} + \sigma^o \qquad (3d)$$

$$V_{e.m.}{}^a = \frac{G^2}{\pi} \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha^2} \int q^4 \frac{d\sigma_e^a}{dq^2} \, dq^2 \qquad (3e)$$

where N is an I = 0 nucleus and x is any possible final state defined by the type of particle involved without discrimination for particular charge states. Thus we may consider the inclusive reaction where we sum over all possible states x or we may limit ourselves to states x with zero or a limited number of additional pions.

To make an isospin analysis we define $U_-^{(I)}$, $U_o^{(I)}$, $U_{em}^{(I)}$ as the contributions of the isovector current to σ_-, σ_o, and V_{em}, respectively, where I = (0, 1, 2) is the isospin of x. Similarly $S_o^{(1)}$ and $M_o^{(1)}$ represent the isoscalar and isoscalar-isovector interference contributions, respectively, to σ_o, which occur only for I = 1. The isospin analysis gives

$$\sigma_o^{\pm} = \frac{1}{3} S_o^{(1)} \mp 2\sqrt{1/6}\, M_o^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} U_o^{(1)} + \frac{3}{10} U_o^{(2)} \qquad (4a)$$

$$\sigma_o^o = \frac{1}{3} S^{(1)} + U_o^{(o)} + \frac{2}{5} U_o^{(2)} \qquad (4b)$$

$$\sigma_-^+ = U_-^{(o)} + \frac{1}{2} U_-^{(1)} + \frac{1}{10} U_-^{(2)} \qquad (4c)$$

$$\sigma_-^- = \frac{3}{5} U_-^{(2)} \qquad (4d)$$

$$\sigma_-^o = \frac{1}{2} U_-^{(1)} + \frac{3}{10} U_-^{(2)} \qquad (4e)$$

From Eqs. (4a) and (4b) we need only the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma_o^{ch} \geq \frac{1}{2} U_o^{(1)} + \frac{3}{10} U_o^{(2)} \tag{5a}$$

$$\sigma_o^{o} \geq U_o^{(o)} + \frac{2}{5} U_o^{(2)} \tag{5b}$$

Similarly

$$\frac{1}{2} V_{em}^{ch} \geq \frac{1}{2} U_{em}^{(1)} + \frac{3}{10} U_{em}^{(2)} \tag{5c}$$

$$V_{em}^{o} \geq U_{em}^{(o)} + \frac{2}{5} U_{em}^{(2)} \tag{5d}$$

Finally we note that Eq. (8b) of Ref. 6 can be applied separately for each value of I:

$$U_o^{(I)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ [U_-^{(I)}]^{1/2} - 2 \sin^2\theta_W [U_{em}^{(I)}]^{1/2} \right\}^2 \tag{6}$$

Combining Eqs. (4), (5), and (6) we obtain our major results[9]

$$R_1 \equiv \frac{\sigma_o^{ch}}{2\sigma_-^{o}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - 2 \sin^2\theta_W \left(\frac{V_{e.m.}^{ch}}{2\sigma_-^{o}} \right)^{1/2} \right]^2 \tag{7a}$$

$$R_2 \equiv \frac{\sigma_o^{o}}{\sigma_-^{ch} - \sigma_-^{o}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - 2 \sin^2\theta_W \left(\frac{V_{e.m.}^{o}}{\sigma_-^{ch} - \sigma_-^{o}} \right)^{1/2} \right]^2 \tag{7b}$$

A somewhat more general result can be obtained[9] in terms of two weighting factors $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$:

$$\frac{\alpha\,\sigma_o^{ch} + \beta\,\sigma_o^{o}}{2\,\alpha\,\sigma_-^{o} + \beta(\sigma_-^{ch} - \sigma_-^{o})} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - 2 \sin^2\theta_W \left[\frac{\alpha V_{e.m}^{ch} + \beta V_{e.m.}^{o}}{2\,\alpha\,\sigma_-^{o} + \beta(\sigma_-^{ch} - \sigma_-^{o})} \right]^{1/2} \right]^2 \tag{7c}$$

If the right-hand sides of Eqs. (7a) and (7b) can be directly evaluated then a weighted sum of these two equations gives a stronger result than Eq. (7c).

However, Eq. (7c) may be useful in special cases; in particular, for $\alpha = \beta = 1$ we obtain a total cross-section ratio

$$R \equiv \frac{\sigma_o^{tot}}{\sigma_-^{tot}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[1 - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left(\frac{V_{e.m.}^{tot}}{\sigma_-^{tot}}\right)^{1/2}\right]^2$$

which is the result previously obtained in Ref. 6.

If we define the charge-to-neutral ratio as $r \equiv \sigma_-^{ch}/\sigma_-^{o}$, which is necessarily greater than or equal to unity, Eqs. (7a) and (7b) can be rewritten in more useful forms

$$R_3 \equiv \frac{\sigma_o^{ch}}{2\sigma_-^{ch}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[r^{-1/2} - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left(\frac{V_{e.m.}^{ch}}{2\sigma_-^{ch}}\right)^{1/2}\right]^2 \qquad (8a)$$

$$R_4 \equiv \frac{\sigma_o^{o}}{2\sigma_-^{o}} \geq \frac{1}{4}\left[(r-1)^{1/2} - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left(\frac{V_{e.m.}^{o}}{\sigma_-^{o}}\right)^{1/2}\right]^2 \qquad (8b)$$

All the above results may also be derived for the case in which N is a free nucleon provided one averages over neutron and proton targets. In particular the results may be applied to the exclusive process of single pion production with the help of the following replacements:

$$\sigma_-^{ch} \to \sigma(\nu + p \to \mu^- + \pi^+ + p) + \sigma(\nu + n \to \mu^- + \pi^+ + n) \qquad (9a)$$

$$\sigma_-^{o} \to \sigma(\nu + n \to \mu^- + \pi^o + p) \qquad (9b)$$

$$\sigma_o^{ch} \to \sigma(\nu + p \to \nu + \pi^+ + n) + \sigma(\nu + n \to \nu + \pi^- + p) \qquad (9c)$$

$$\sigma_o^{o} \to \sigma(\nu + p \to \nu + \pi^o + p) + \sigma(\nu + n \to \nu + \pi^o + n) \qquad (9d)$$

$$V_{em}^{ch} \to V_{em}(e + p \to e + \pi^+ + n) + V_{em}(e + n \to e + \pi^- + p) \quad (9e)$$

$$V_{em}^{o} \to V_{em}(e + p \to e + \pi^o + p) + V_{em}(e + n \to e + \pi^o + n) \quad (9f)$$

As in Ref. 6 these results may be extended to anti-neutrino reactions. We define

$$\sigma_+^a = \sigma(\bar{\nu}_\mu + N \to \mu^+ + \pi^a + x) \quad (10a)$$

$$\bar{\sigma}_o^a = \sigma(\bar{\nu}_\mu + N \to \bar{\nu}_\mu + \pi^a + x) \quad (10b)$$

$$\Sigma^a = \sigma_+^a + \sigma_-^a \quad (10c)$$

$$\Sigma_o^a = \sigma_o^a + \bar{\sigma}_o^a \quad (10d)$$

The previous results, Eqs. (7) and (8), hold with the replacements $\sigma_-^a \to \sigma_+^a$ and $\sigma_o^a \to \bar{\sigma}_o^a$. Analogous to Eq. (18) of Ref. 6 we find

$$\bar{R}_1 \equiv \frac{\Sigma_o^{ch}}{2\Sigma^o} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[1 - 8\sin^2\theta_W\left[1 - \sin^2\theta_W\right]\frac{V_{e.m.}^{ch}}{2\Sigma^o}\right] \quad (11a)$$

$$\bar{R}_2 \equiv \frac{\Sigma_o^{o}}{\Sigma^{ch} - \Sigma^o} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[1 - 8\sin^2\theta_W\left[1 - \sin^2\theta_W\right]\frac{V_{e.m.}^{o}}{\Sigma^{ch} - \Sigma^o}\right] \quad (11b)$$

Analogous to Eq. (20) of Ref. 6 we find

$$\bar{R}_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sin^2\theta_W)\left[1 + \frac{\sin^2\theta_W}{B_1(1-\sin^2\theta_W)} - 4\sin^2\theta_W\left(\frac{V_{e.m.}^{ch}}{2\sigma_-^o}\right)\right] \quad (12a)$$

$$\bar{R}_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sin^2\theta_W)\left[1 + \frac{\sin^2\theta_W}{B_2(1-\sin^2\theta_W)} - 4\sin^2\theta_W\frac{V_{e.m.}^{o}}{\sigma_-^{ch} - \sigma_-^o}\right] \quad (12b)$$

where B_1 and B_2 are the experimental upper limits:

$$\frac{\sigma_-^{o}}{\sigma_+^{o}} \leq B_1 \qquad \frac{\sigma_-^{ch} - \sigma_-^{o}}{\sigma_+^{ch} - \sigma_+^{o}} \leq B_2$$

We would also like to be able to use data on isolated proton targets. From Eq. (31) of Ref. 6 we have

$$\frac{\sigma_o(\Delta^+)}{\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})} \geq \frac{1}{3}\left[1 - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left(\frac{V_{e.m.}(\Delta^+)}{\frac{2}{3}\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}\right)^{1/2}\right]^2 \qquad (13)$$

where

$$\sigma_o(\Delta^+) = \sigma(\nu + p \to \nu + \Delta^+)$$

$$\sigma_e(\Delta^+) = \sigma(e + p \to e + \Delta^+)$$

$$\sigma_-(\Delta^{++}) = \sigma(\nu + p \to \mu^- + p + \pi^+)$$

This involves no assumptions provided Δ simply means an $I = \frac{3}{2}$ final state. However we are interested in

$$R_5 \equiv \frac{\sigma(\nu + p \to \nu + p + \pi^o)}{\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}$$

$$R_6 \equiv \frac{\sigma(\nu + p \to \nu + n + \pi^+)}{\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}$$

By using only isospin properties of the final states we obtain

$$R_5 + R_6 = \frac{\sigma(\nu + p \rightarrow \nu + \Delta^+) + \sigma(\nu + p \rightarrow \nu + N'^+)}{\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{3}\left\{1 - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left[\frac{V_{e.m.}(\Delta^+)}{\frac{2}{3}\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}\right]^{1/2}\right\}^2 \qquad (14)$$

where N' is an I = 1/2 final state. Note that the 1/2 - 3/2 interference terms cancel out and that the N' term was dropped and Eq. (13) used to obtain the inequality above. This result is true in both models of Ref. 1 and 8, independent of any dynamical assumptions.

To obtain limits on R_5 and R_6 separately we need to make a further assumption. In Sec. IV we consider the case of the simple Weinberg model. Here we make the assumption that there is no interference between $I = \frac{1}{2}$ and $I = \frac{3}{2}$ final states since interference is expected to be small on the average over the resonance region. In this case any $I = \frac{1}{2}$ contribution can only increase both $p\,\pi^0$ and $n\,\pi^+$ so that the $I = \frac{3}{2}$ contributions can be used to obtain lower limits:

$$R_5 \geq \frac{2}{9}\left\{1 - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left[\frac{V_{e.m.}(\Delta^+)}{\frac{2}{3}\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}\right]^{1/2}\right\}^2 \qquad (15a)$$

$$R_6 \geq \frac{1}{9}\left\{1 - 2\sin^2\theta_W \left[\frac{V_{e.m.}(\Delta^+)}{\frac{2}{3}\sigma_-(\Delta^{++})}\right]^{1/2}\right\}^2 \qquad (15b)$$

III. NUMERICAL ESTIMATES

In order to obtain numerical estimates for the bounds derived in part II, one needs data for both the electromagnetic and weak charged-current reactions on the same I = 0 nucleus. The charged-current neutrino cross sections can be obtained from the total inelastic cross section[10] measurement at 2 GeV

$$\sigma_-^{o} + \sigma_-^{ch} = 1.0 \times 10^{-38}\ \mathrm{cm}^2/\mathrm{nucleon}, \tag{16a}$$

along with the ratio

$$r = \sigma_-^{ch}/\sigma_-^{o} \simeq 2.0 \tag{16b}$$

determined by the CERN neutrino group using the Gargamelle chamber.[11] The latter value is in substantial agreement with the result

$$\sigma_-^{+}/\sigma_-^{o} = 2.3 \pm 0.9 \tag{16c}$$

from the old freon experiment,[12] whereas Δ dominance requires the value r = 5. Evidence is present for final state strong interactions.

For the corresponding electromagnetic interactions, no data exist for the same heavy nuclei. In its place, we use the data of Galster et al.[13] on hydrogen to estimate

$$V_{em}(e + p \rightarrow e + \Delta^{+}) = 0.156 \times 10^{-38}\ \mathrm{cm}^2 \tag{17a}$$

at 2 GeV and obtain V_{em}^{o} and V_{em}^{ch} for a complex nucleus by assuming that (1) $V_{em}^{o}/V_{em}^{ch} = 1.5$ (17b)

and (2) there is at most 25% incoherent background.

The above imply

$$V_{em}^{ch} = 0.156 \times \frac{1.0}{2.5} \times 10^{-38} = 0.078 \times 10^{-38}\ \mathrm{cm}^2/\mathrm{nucleon} \quad (18a)$$

$$V_{em}^{o} = 0.117 \times 10^{-38}\ \mathrm{cm}^2/\mathrm{nucleon}. \quad (18b)$$

We shall later provide a generous allowance for this uncertainty.

Finally we note that the angle θ_W has been bounded by $\sin^2\theta_W \leq 0.33$ in Ref. 2, where one standard deviation in the experimental data for $\bar{\nu}_e + e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + e$ was allowed. To be conservative in what follows, we shall take

$$\sin^2\theta_W \lesssim 0.40 \quad (19)$$

which corresponds to[2]

$$\frac{\sigma(\bar{\nu}_e + e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + e)_{\mathrm{expt.}}}{\sigma(\bar{\nu}_e + e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + e)_{\mathrm{V-A}}} \lesssim 3.$$

Several of the bounds listed in Sec. II are of particular interest, and we discuss them in some detail. The ratio, $R_4 = \sigma_o^{\,o}/2\sigma_-^{\,o}$ has been bounded both by the Columbia group[14]

$$R_4 \leq 0.14 \quad (90\%\ \mathrm{c.l.}) \quad (20a)$$

and by the Gargamelle group[11]

$$R_4 \leq 0.11 \quad (90\%\ \mathrm{c.l.}) \quad (20b)$$

In Table I we estimate the lower bound for this ratio for values of r ranging from 5 down to 2. It is clear that the experimental results in (20) contradict the predictions of the model only if $r \gtrsim 3$.

A similar ratio, $R_3 = \sigma_o^{\,ch}/2\sigma_-^{\,ch}$, will probably be measured in the near future. The ratio, $R_1 = \sigma_o^{ch}/2\sigma_-^{o} = rR_3$, is of interest because it is rather insensitive to the ratio r and is fairly large. The lower bounds on the ratios $\overline{R}_1$ and $\overline{R}_2$ given in (12a) and (12b) cannot be estimated until sufficient data for the antineutrino reactions are obtained which will determine B_1 and B_2.

There is also an experimental bound for

$$R_5 + R_6 \leq 0.31 \quad (90\% \text{ c.l.}) \tag{21}$$

from a recent Argonne experiment.[15] All quantities on the right hand side of Eq. (14) are measureable. Using the new Argonne result

$$\sigma(\nu + p \to \mu^- + p + \pi^+) = (0.78 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-38} \text{ cm}^2 \tag{22}$$

we obtain

$$R_5 + R_6 \geq 0.10. \tag{23}$$

This bound holds in both models and it is independent of any additional dynamical assumptions.

IV. WEINBERG MODEL

In the simple Weinberg model $J_\lambda^S = -2 \sin^2\theta_W \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} V_\lambda^{8}$ leading to

$$J_\lambda^{(o)} = J_\lambda^3 - 2 \sin^2\theta_W J_\lambda^{em}. \tag{24}$$

It now follows that for any states $|\alpha>$, $|\beta>$

$$|<\beta|J_\lambda^{(o)}|\alpha>|^2 \geq \left[|<\beta|J_\lambda^3|\alpha>| - 2 \sin^2\theta_W |<\beta|J_\lambda^{em}|\alpha>| \right]^2 \tag{25}$$

with the isoscalar-isovector interference being completely absorbed in the electromagnetic matrix element. The advantage of (22) is apparent in that it allows us to state bounds for the following ratios which do not average over the final charge states of the pion or over protons and neutrons in the target:

$$R_6 \equiv \frac{\sigma(\nu + p \to \nu + n + \pi^+)}{\sigma(\bar{\nu} + p \to \mu^- + p + \pi^+)} \tag{26a}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2}\left\{\left[\frac{\sigma(\nu + n \to \mu^- + p + \pi^o)}{\sigma(\nu + p \to \mu^- + p + \pi^+)}\right]^{1/2} - 2\sin^2\theta_w \left[\frac{V_{em}(e + p \to e + n + \pi^+)}{\sigma(\nu + p \to \mu^- + p + \pi^+)}\right]^{1/2}\right\}^2$$

$$R_7 \equiv \frac{\sigma_o^-}{\sigma_-^o} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left\{1 - 2\sin^2\theta_w\left(\frac{V_{em}^-}{\sigma_-^o}\right)^{1/2}\right\}^2 \tag{26b}$$

One could obtain a similar result for R_5; however it is more useful to consider the sum $R_5 + R_6$ because as it was discussed in the previous section it can be bounded by Eq. (14) in both the Weinberg and the Glashow-Iliopoulos-Maiani models.

The last ratio is appealing from the experimental point of view because σ_o^- has a clear signal; i.e., a π^- always converts in the chamber so that the only ambiguity arises in confusing μ^- as a π^-. Thus such bounds are rather safe.

Numerical estimates can be obtained using the results of the previous section. The ratio R_7 is numerically equal to that of R_1 given in Table I. There is already an experimental bound for the ratio

$$R_6 \leq 0.16 \quad (90\% \text{ c.l.}) \tag{27}$$

from an old CERN experiment.[16] Since data for $\sigma(\nu n \rightarrow \mu^- p \pi^0)$, occuring in Eq. (26a), are not available, we assume that the isospin amplitudes are incoherent and get

$$R_6 \geq 0.03 \tag{28}$$

V. SUMMARY

We have derived bounds for weak pion production relevant to present and future experiments. The bounds R_1 through R_4 follow in both the simple Weinberg and GIM models for neutrinos incident on isospin zero targets. Similar relations hold when one averages over protons and neutrons as indicated by the substitutions given in Eq. (9). When both neutrino and antineutrino cross sections are available, they can be combined to give the results stated in Eqs. (11) and (12).

For isolated proton targets, one can derive the bound (14) for the sum $R_5 + R_6$ which also holds in both Weinberg and GIM models and is independent of any additional dynamical assumptions. Bounds stated in Eq. (15) for R_5 and R_6 separately require either $I = 3/2$ dominance or incoherence of the isospin amplitudes. However in the specific Weinberg model in which the neutral current is given by Eq. (24), one can obtain theoretical bounds for R_6 and R_7 as given in Eq. (26) without any additional assumptions.

Comparisons between the present upper experimental bounds and lower theoretical bounds were discussed in Sections III and IV. The present experimental limit of 0.31 for $R_5 + R_6$ from the Argonne group is well above the estimated lower limit of 0.10. This test for weak pion production in hydrogen is very clean, and better statistics should be obtained in the near future.

The comparisons in complex nuclei depend critically on the charged/neutral pion production ratio observed in the charged current reactions as seen from Table I. Moreover, the neutrino reactions on complex nuclei have not been carried out with isoscalar targets, although the use of heavy liquid freon is probably a good approximation. This situation should improve when propane is used in the large Gargamelle chamber at CERN. In order to make the comparisons more accurate, we also require data for inclusive pion electroproduction in heavy nuclei. To the extent that these large uncertainties are included in Table I, we see that the present experimental upper limits on R_4 are still compatible with the theoretical predictions based on the models of references 1 and 8.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Letters 19, 1264 (1967); Phys. Rev. D5, 1412 (1972). See also A. Salam, Elementary Particle Theory, edited by N. Svartholm (Almquist and Forlag A. B., Stockholm, 1968).

[2] H. H. Chen and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. D5, 1874 (1972); G. 't Hooft, Phys. Letters 37B, 197 (1971).

[3] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D5, 1412 (1972).

[4] B. W. Lee, Phys. Letters 40B, 420 (1972).

[5] A. Pais and S. B. Treiman, Phys. Rev. D6, 2700 (1972).

[6] E. A. Paschos and L. Wolfenstein, NAL preprint to be published in Phys. Rev. D.

[7] One exception to this remark can be found in Ref. 6 (footnote 18) where a crude estimate of the non-resonant background is taken into account.

[8] S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. D2, 1285 (1970). This paper is referred to as GIM in the text.

[9] We use $(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{c})^2 + (\sqrt{b} - \sqrt{d})^2 \geq (\sqrt{a+b} - \sqrt{c+d})^2$.

[10] Preliminary results of the Gargamelle Collaboration were presented by Ph. Heusse at the XVI International Conference on High Energy Physics, Chicago - Batavia, 1972.

[11] Preliminary results were presented by V. Brisson at the XVI International Conference on High Energy Physics, Chicago - Batavia, 1972.

[12] C. Baltay, Proceedings of the 1972 Europhysics Neutrino Conference, Balatonfüred, Hungary.

[13] S. Galster, G. Hartwig, H. Klein, J. Moritz, K.H. Schmidt, W. Schmidt-Parzefall, and D. Wegener, Phys. Rev. D5, 519 (1972).

[14] W. Lee, Phys. Letters 40B, 423 (1972).

[15] Results from the Argonne experiment were presented by Y. Cho at the XVI International Conference on High Energy Physics, Chicago - Batavia 1972. The new value of $\sigma(\nu p \to \mu^- \pi^+ p)$ obtained by Argonne group for neutrino energies greater than 1.3 GeV is lower than the older value of $(1.13 \pm .28) \times 10^{-38}$ cm^2 derived from the 1967 CERN experiment; cf. I. Budagov, et al., Phys. Letters 29B, 524 (1969). The lower value used for this cross section results in lower and more conservative bounds on the cross section ratios quoted in our paper.

[16] D.C. Cundy, G. Myatt, F.A. Nezrick, J.B.M. Pattison, D.H. Perkins, C.A. Ramm, W. Venus, and H.W. Wachsmuth, Phys. Letters 31B, 478 (1970).

	R_1		R_3		R_4	
r	a	b	a	b	a	b
5	0.19	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.44	0.28
4	0.21	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.32	0.19
3	0.23	0.15	0.08	0.05	0.19	0.10
2	0.26	0.19	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.03

TABLE I

Lower bounds on the ratios R_i as functions of the ratio $r = \sigma_-^{ch}/\sigma_-^{o}$ for (a) V_{em} given by Eqs.(18) and for (b) V_{em} twice the values in Eqs. (18).